DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 353 667 EA 024 600

AUTHOR	Seeley, David S.
TITLE	Needed: A New Kind of Educational Leadership. Policy Perspective and Action: School Leadership and Education Reform. PPA #1.
INSTITUTION	National Center for School Leadership, Urbana, IL.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	[92]
CONTRACT	R117C80003
NOTE	19p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Center for School Leadership, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1208 W. Springfield Avenue, Urbana, IL 61801 ($4).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrator Education; Administrator Effectiveness; *Administrator Role; *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; Educational Cooperation; Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership; *Leadership Qualities; Leadership Training; Models; Public Education

ABSTRACT

A framework for developing a new kind of educational leadership is described in this paper, which is based on three propositions. The first proposition states that the policy framework of U.S. public education is undergoing fundamental changes: a goal shift from tolerating mediocrity to expecting educational success for all, and a process shift from bureaucratic organization to a partnership model. The second proposition argues that these changes call not only for improved leadership, but for a different kind of leadership based on commitment to new goals and process, the ability to motivate commitment in others, and the ability to function during the transition. Finally, these leadership needs have significant implications for the selection and preparation of educational leaders. To meet these special leadership needs, changes are recommended with regard to recruitment; selection; preservice and inservice training; paradigm competence; passion, persistence, and political savvy; history, philosophy, and political theory; race, class, and cultural bias; and celebration of the drama and importance of the change. (Contains 14 references.) (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED353667

THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

S. Parker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Policy Perspective and Action: School Leadership and Education Reform

PPA #1

Needed: A New Kind of Educational Leadership

by David Seeley

EA 024 600

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Center for School Leadership

Committed to Leadership and Learning

About The National Center for School Leadership

Our objectives are to produce new knowledge about school leadership and influence the practice and preparation of school leaders. Through various research programs and dissemination activities, we aim to give school leaders effective strategies and methods to influence teaching and learning.

The Center is funded by a grant from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Grant No. R117C80003). Any opinions, findings, and conclusions expressed in this publication are those of the National Center and authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the supporting agency.

Center staff

Paul Thurston, Director
Stephanie Parker, Associate Director
Richard Privitt, Visiting Project Coordinator

Office of Educational Research and Improvement

Ronald Anson, Liaison

The National Center for School Leadership
University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign
1208 West Springfield Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801
1(800)643-3205
Fax number (217)244-4948

National Advisory Panel

David Clark, Chair
Chair, Department of Educational Administration, University of North Carolina

Gary Gottfredson
Professor, Center for the Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University

Milbrey McLaughlin
Professor and Director, Center for Research on the Context of Secondary School Teaching, Stanford University

Kent D. Peterson
Professor, Department of Educational Administration, University of Wisconsin at Madison

Laraine Roberts
Director, Leadership in Educational Administration Development (L.E.A.D.) Project, California

Lynn St. James
Principal, Lindblom Technical High School, Chicago

Scott Thomson
Executive Director, National Policy Board for Educational Administration

Lonnie Wagstaff
Professor, Educational Administration, University of Texas at Austin

Project Investigators

University of Illinois at Urbana

Paul Thurston, Head and Professor, Administration, Higher and Continuing Education
Frederick Wirt, Professor, Political Science
Renee Clift, Associate Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
Betty Merchant, Assistant Professor, Administration, Higher and Continuing Education

The University of Michigan

Martin Maehr, Professor, Education and Psychology
Carol Midgley, Project Associate

MetriTech, Inc.

Samuel Krug, President
Chris Scott, Project Investigator

Illinois State Board of Education

Visiting Scholars

William Boyd, Professor, Education, Penn State University
Robert Crowson, Professor, Educational Administration, University of Illinois at Chicago
Charles Kerchner, Professor, Education and Public Policy, Claremont Graduate School
Douglas Mitchell, Professor, Education, University of California at Riverside

NEEDED:
A NEW KIND OF EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

David S. Seeley
City University of New York
College of Staten Island

Needed: A New Kind of Educational Leadership

by David S. Seeley
City University of New York
College of Staten Island

ABSTRACT

The paper proposes a thesis of three propositions:

1. The policy framework of public education in the United States is undergoing fundamental changes. Two especially important for leadership needs are: (1) a **goal** shift from tolerating substantial amounts of mediocrity and failure to expecting educational **success for all**, and (2) a **process** shift from bureaucratic organization to a **partnership** model to achieve these new goals.

2. These changes call not just for improved leadership, but for a **different kind** of leadership: including commitment to the new goals and process, ability to get others so committed, and ability to function in the transition while the shifts are made. This will require leaders with greater conceptual competence, passion, persistence and political savvy.

3. These leadership needs have significant implications for the selection and preparation of educational leaders.

The paper analogizes the changes in the policy framework of public education to the "paradigm shifts" studied by Thomas Kuhn in science, in that they require changes in basic assumptions, mind-sets, and life-long habits. This explains both the difficulty of making the shifts and the importance of a special kind of leadership in the years ahead.

To meet these special leadership needs, changes are recommended with regard to recruitment, selection, pre-service training, in-service training, paradigm competence, passion, persistence, and political savvy, history, philosophy and political theory, race, class, and cultural bias, and celebration of the drama and importance of the change.

This paper is an adaptation of a paper delivered at the Third Biennial Conference of the International Council on Educational Leadership, Shanghai, China, July, 1991.

Needed: A New Kind of Educational Leadership

by David S. Seeley

The purpose of this paper is to propose a relatively simple thesis of three propositions:

1. The policy framework of public education in the United States is undergoing fundamental changes.

2. These changes call not just for improved leadership, but for a *different kind* of leadership.

3. These leadership needs have significant implications for the selection and development of educational leaders.

Although the outline of this thesis is simple, the issues involved are complex and wide-ranging. This paper will focus on only limited aspects of each of the three propositions--which are often neglected in current policy and practice.

Two Fundamental Shifts in Public Education Policy in the U. S.

There are many public education policy changes afoot in the United States today: national testing, choice, school-based management, professionalization of teaching, increased collaboration with other institutions (families, businesses, community organizations), multiculturalism, etc. This paper will focus on only two important shifts in policy, because (a) they are fundamental and will affect the success, failure, and nature of all other reforms; (b) the preparation of leaders for these policy shifts is essential for their effective implementation; and (c) they represent a special kind of policy shift with important implications for the type of leadership needed, and for the selection and preparation of leaders.

The two shifts can be described as:

1. a shift from universal schooling to universal education, i.e., from a commitment to have all children attend school, with many children failing to achieve adequate levels of education, to a commitment to educate nearly all children to a level now reached by perhaps 20-30%. This is a shift in *goals*.

2. a shift from a bureaucratic organizational model--with the school seen as a separate agency organized to "deliver instruction" to pupils-to a collaborative or partnership model in which those within the school operate as a team, and in which home, school, and community work in collaboration

to achieve the much higher levels of learning and character development called for in the shift in goals. This is a shift in *process.*

These two shifts are, of course, far more complex, both in concept and in reality, than these highly simplified descriptions suggest. Many people, for instance, find it hard to accept that, whatever the intention or rhetoric of its original founders or current policy makers, high educational achievement for all children has not been the operational goal of most public schools or most American communities. The typical pattern is for large numbers of children to gain only a mediocre education at best, with many failing to get even the most minimal education. In the past it has been assumed either that nothing need be done about this (these learning levels have been deemed acceptable or inevitable) or that all that is required is to institute various "remedial" programs, whether or not they actually produce acceptable levels of learning. In effect, public education has been a "winners and losers" game, with many children, especially poor and minority children (but many others as well), being the losers. Now public policy is shifting to make acceptable levels of learning and character development for all children the operational goal of public schools: If acceptable levels are not achieved, an effective remedy has to be found to achieve the desired result.

The process shift---from a bureaucratic organization to a collaborative or partnership approach to education--has come from a growing recognition that an effective remedy is not possible within the present bureaucratic culture of most American public schools and the educational and political cultures of most communities---that these cultures are not capable of producing the levels of student, parent and teacher commitment and engagement necessary for achieving the much higher levels of learning and character development now needed.

The realization of the dysfunctional nature of the present education system, although becoming more widespread, is not accepted by everyone. Many people are deceived about the disabilities of the present system, because public schooling does not follow classic bureaucratic forms. What we seem to have is many of the disadvantages of bureaucracy without its supposed advantages. Teachers--and, in large systems, even principals--are seen as low level bureaucratic functionaries in administratively top-heavy, rule-ridden systems. The result is that teachers are not treated as professionals, and schools do not generate the teamwork, commitment and incentives for teachers to be really productive in helping children become successful learners. Students are made the passive recipients of instruction "delivered" to them, and are to a large extent not engaged in the learning process. And parents are relegated to roles as tax payers and voters who supposedly can hold the system "accountable" for educating their children through school boards and superintendents, rather than playing an intimate and intensive role in the educational process itself. Yet the supposed accountability of bureaucratic organizations and a tight "chain of command" is usually missing.

The conclusion being reached is that this kind of education organization must be "restructured" if the new, much higher levels of achievement are to be attained. While there are many different definitions of "restructuring," the most fundamental, and the most necessary, is the shift from a bureaucratic "service delivery" approach to a collaborative approach. This does not mean giving up all aspects of bureaucratic organization. In fact, the setting of clear goals and finding better ways to assess their achievement are aspects of the classic bureaucratic model that many people feel need to be strengthened, and work is now proceeding on this front through national and state goal-setting and assessment efforts. But at the school and local communities level, where teaching and learning take place, there must be, and is now beginning to be, a shift away from bureaucratic culture and a redefinition of roles and relationships so that all the participants can work together more productively to ensure that the desired educational goals are achieved. Henry Levin's "Accelerated Schools," Ted Sizer's "Essential Schools," and the "Comer Process" schools developed by James Comer are just a few examples of efforts in the last decade to move in this direction.[1]

Educational Restructuring as a Paradigm Shift

In what sense are these shifts in policy framework "special kinds of policy shifts," i.e. different from most policy shifts in public education--and different in ways that are important in terms of the type of leadership they require and the selection and preparation of leaders? They are special because they are profound changes not just in policy, but in the policy framework of public schooling. They will require changes not just in the current practices but in long-established mind-sets, values, roles and relationships.

One way to understand the special nature of these policy framework shifts is to compare them to the "paradigm shifts" in science studied by Thomas Kuhn in his now famous essay, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions.*[2] Kuhn points out that in science there are times when the existing conceptual framework in a particular field--the basic assumptions, definitions, theoretical models, etc.--no longer function adequately. The framework no longer is able to explain the data derived from experimentation or observation, and too many contradictions emerge to allow coherent development of theory. At such times one or more scientists who are trying to solve these "puzzles" invent a new conceptual framework they think will work better. If it turns out to work better, it is little by little accepted as the new conceptual framework for the field. Kuhn called these competing conceptual frameworks "paradigms," and the shifts from one conceptual framework to another "paradigm shifts."

A classic example of this kind of paradigm shift in the development of European science was the "Copernican Revolution," when Copernicus concluded that the old Ptolemaic, earth-centered conceptual model of the solar system did not work well enough, and proposed a new model with the sun in the center. The theories under the old paradigm

were getting more and more complicated and contradictory--and the new paradigm seemed not only much simpler but more likely to be successful in explaining the data observed with the increasingly powerful telescopes and measurements being developed.

What is interesting about paradigm shifts of this kind in science, and why they are relevant to certain types of shifts in educational or other public policy, is that even in science where one might expect ready acceptance of more workable conceptual frameworks, they are usually resisted--sometimes quite strenuously and successfully--for many years, and in ways that are analogous to the resistance to similar types of fundamental shifts in policy frameworks. Kuhn reports that

> Copernicanism made few converts for almost a century after Copernicus' death. Newton's work was not generally accepted, particularly on the Continent, for more than half a century after the *Principia* appeared. Priestly never accepted the oxygen theory, nor Lord Kelvin the electromagnetic theory, and so on. The difficulties of conversion have often been noted by scientists themselves. Darwin . . wrote, "Although I am fully convinced of the truth of the views given in this volume . . . , I by no means expect to convince experienced naturalists whose minds are stocked with a multitude of facts all viewed, during a long course of years, from a point of view directly opposite to mine." . . . And Max Plank . . . sadly remarked that "a new scientific truth does not triumph by convincing its opponents and making them see the light, but rather because its opponents eventually die, and a new generation grows up that is familiar with it." . . . The transfer of allegiance from paradigm to paradigm is a conversion experience that cannot be forced. Lifelong resistance, particularly from those whose productive careers have committed them to an older tradition of normal science . . [is based on their] assurance that the older paradigm will ultimately solve all its problems. . . .Inevitably, at times of revolution [i.e. paradigm shift], that assurance seems stubborn and pigheaded as indeed it sometimes becomes." (pp. 150-151)

The shifts in goals and process I have discussed above that are now underway in the United States can be seen as analogous to such a paradigm shift in science. The old "winners and losers"/bureaucratic school policy paradigm no longer works. Its failure is not as in science that it fails to explain scientific data "puzzles" or to facilitate coherent scientific theory, but that it fails to solve the educational policy "puzzles" confronting the society, and fails to facilitate the development of coherent educational policy.

To say that as a result of this failure of the old policy paradigm, a paradigm shift is now underway in American public educational policy, is in no way to say that the shift has been accomplished. On the contrary, the process has just begun, and most schools still operate as they have for decades, without serious commitment to the educational success of all

children or significant shift from the prevailing bureaucratic school culture. Nor is it clear that these shifts will be successfully accomplished. There is in fact a great struggle now going on, both in the political arena and within the schools, with regard to these shifts--a struggle over whether a paradigm shift is needed at all (many educators "whose productive careers have committed them to an older tradition" see no need for it), over different definitions of the restructuring needed, among various interest groups, and against the vast powers of inertia that block change in any complex and entrenched institution.

It is here that leadership comes in. For it will take extraordinary leadership, and leadership of a different kind from what we have had in the past, to ensure the transition of the American public school system from the lumbering dinosaur it has become to the effective mobilizer and developer of human capacities that is must become in the future.

A New Kind of Leadership Needed

> "He who will not apply new remedies must expect new evils, for time is the greatest innovator."
>
> -- Francis Bacon[3]

Leadership is relative. The kind of leadership needed for one kind of situation is different from that required in another. A lieutenant leading his troops into battle exercises a different kind of leadership from that of the saint changing people's lives through example, and different again from that of a politician trying to pass a piece of legislation. As John Gardner has pointed out, "Leaders cannot be thought of apart from the historic context in which they arise, the setting in which they function . . . and the system over which they preside."[4]

What is the "setting" for educational leadership in the United States today? That it is a setting calling for change rather than management of the status quo has been noted by virtually all who have considered the educational leadership needs of the school system. But the *type* of change and its implications for the type of leadership needed are often not adequately considered. *Leaders for America's School's,* for instance, the 1987 report of the National Commission on Excellence in Education Administration, sponsored by the University Council for Educational Administration, says many excellent things about what an educational leader needs to be able to do to *run* the kind of schools needed for today's world (e.g. foster collegiality, involve parents, etc.), but says very little about the type of leadership needed to *create* these kinds of schools.

Not only is the type of leadership needed to change a system different from that needed to maintain a system, but the type of leadership needed also differs depending on the type of change required. One kind of leader may be sufficient if all that is needed is the improvement of the institution's procedures and operations. Another is needed, if, as I

argue is the case now in American public education, the changes require profound shifts in the basic assumptions, goals, values, relationships, and policy framework of the institution--i.e. something akin to a paradigm shift.

The type of leadership will also vary depending on whether these profound changes are to be brought about through political revolution, the democratic political process, or through institutional change within existing schools and school systems. My own assumption is that in the United States for the foreseeable future the needed shifts will be brought about through a combination of democratic political process (legislation, "blue ribbon" commissions, school board politics, etc.) and institutional change. The restructuring of public education will be, as Phillip Schlecty has said, like rebuilding an aeroplane while it is flying--except that public education is not a machine whose rebuilding calls just for changing some mechanical parts for others, but a highly complex human institution whose restructuring requires changes in the roles, relationships, values, mind-sets of all the participants.

The leadership needed for this process requires at a minimum:

1. commitment to the new paradigm--in this case to the goal of success for all children and to a partnership approach for achieving this goal.

2. ability to get others committed to the new paradigm--and, again, the "others" includes students, parents and community, as well as teachers and other school staff.

3. ability to function in the ambiguity of schools and school systems which have not yet shifted to the new paradigm--which are at most still in transition from deeply entrenched "winners and losers" expectations and bureaucratic culture.

These three leadership requirements call for competencies that are quite different from those called for in managing the existing public school system. A leader whose job is to maintain an existing institution can rely on the vision and values embodied in the institution, but a leader who is building a new kind of institution, must have in his or her mind at least the outline of a model of what is to be built. And to win people over to a new vision--especially one that threatens many established assumptions, habits, relationships and interests--calls for leadership that is very different from getting people to comply with bureaucratic rules or improving the efficiency of a sluggish operation.

The leadership requirements for shifting to a new policy paradigm in an institution like public education are more difficult than for shifting to a new paradigm in science: In science, proposers of new paradigms can often carry on their work alone until others are

won over, and, where needed, they can often get enough support for an independent laboratory to develop their new approach. Changing the present public education policy paradigm requires wading into the political arena and gaining support on a much broader basis. It can't be done just on a "laboratory" basis.

James MacGregor Burns uses the term "transformational leadership" to refer to many of the aspects of the leadership needed. He distinguishes it from "transactional" leadership in which the "deals" made between leaders and subordinates may be quite adequate to keep an institution running (even running efficiently and effectively if the transactional leadership is exercised skillfully), but which is inadequate for lifting an institution to a new vision or shifting it to a new paradigm.[5]

The Four P's of Paradigm Leadership

The leadership needed for shifting to a new paradigm calls for conceptual understanding that is often lacking in present leaders--understanding of the new paradigm, and of the process of shifting paradigms--what I'll call "paradigm competence." But such intellectual understanding by itself is not enough. To be successful in leading the paradigm shift will require three other "P's": passion, persistence, and political savvy--passion because the leader will have to demonstrate great commitment in order to win people over, persistence because it will take a long time, much trial and error and the overcoming of many obstacles, and political savvy because public education is a highly social and political institution. Cicero called a functioning community "a partnership for the common good," and it will require the exercise of great political skills to convert public education into this kind of community.[6]

Kuhn points out that, in science, "When a new candidate for paradigm is first proposed, it has seldom solved more than a few of the problems that confront it, and most of those solutions are still far from perfect. . . . Ordinarily, it is only much later, after the paradigm has been developed, accepted, and exploited that apparently decisive arguments . . are developed."[7] This is very much the situation with the new success-for-all/partnership paradigm for American public education today. The new paradigm has far from proved itself, and those who must lead the transformation must have a deep conviction that it will help us solve our present problems better than the current "winners-and-losers"/ bureaucratic paradigm.

The Selection and Preparation of New Educational Leaders

The question is--and it is one of the most important and neglected questions in current educational reform in the United States: How are we going to produce the kind of leadership described above---the kind of leadership needed to make the shifts in policy

framework now so necessary in American public education policy? The answer is: with great difficulty!

Practical people may feel entitled to somewhat more helpful advice than this, and I will try to say a few things that may be done about it before I'm through. But before doing so, perhaps the most useful advice is to recognize--and emphasize more strongly--the difficulty. It will take extraordinary measures, not just the improvement of existing selection and training procedures, to produce the leadership now needed. We, in effect, will need a paradigm shift in the policy framework for producing educational leaders to match the paradigm shift needed in educational policy. In fact, the first shift will have to be to a "crisis management" paradigm, to meet the extraordinary needs for new leadership on an emergency basis, since school systems are already initiating the restructuring process, and the existing leadership preparation and selection procedures are totally inadequate for meeting this need. Furthermore, in some jurisdictions, increasing retirements are opening many new leadership positions, and it is urgent that candidates be prepared and selected who can provide the new leadership needed. During perhaps the next ten or fifteen years, while the emergency steps are taken to meet immediate needs, a new paradigm can be developed for preparing and selecting the leaders who will be needed for continuing the change process and then for maintaining the new kind of success-for-all/partnership system that is established.

The reason for new leadership and new training (again following the Kuhnian analysis) is that those who have learned how to function under one policy paradigm have great difficulty even shifting to a new paradigm, let alone leading the shift. As John Gardner has pointed out, "Unfortunately, those who have fitted themselves assiduously to the system often cannot save the system."[8] And yet, as noted above, those in leadership positions in public education must know how to run the present unshifted system while it is in transition to the new paradigm (flying the aeroplane while trying to change it). The number of people who meet these dual and somewhat contradictory leadership requirements is very small. The usual selection and training procedures are not likely to produce them.

Much more could be said about what to do about this than can be contained in this paper, but here are some brief comments on some of the things that seem to me to be most often neglected:

1. Recruitment. Most American school administrators are not recruited; they are self-selected. Those with ambitions to climb the bureaucratic ladder take the necessary preparation programs, get themselves credentialed, and politic to be selected for higher positions in the hierarchy. Instead of this passive approach, school systems must make active efforts to seek out the people now needed for helping the system shift to the new paradigm. They may not have pushed themselves forward. They may be trying to "do their

own thing" in their own classroom or isolated program. Because few people will be found who are both fully expert in running the existing system and qualified to lead the paradigm shift, compromises will have to be made in finding and encouraging people who have enough of both characteristics so that, with additional preparation, they can at least come close to meeting both leadership needs.

2. Selection. The selection process for educational leaders is haphazard at best (and corrupt at worst) in most American public school systems. In many cases, the bureaucratic culture of the system does not even include leadership as an important criterion for selection, let alone the special kind of leadership required for the needed paradigm shift. School boards and other hiring authorities, as well as the professional consultants who help school boards in their selections, will have to give much more thought and attention to defining the qualities required for today's educational leadership, and then to discerning whether candidates have these qualities. As with recruitment, compromises will have to be made in balancing the paradigm leadership qualities (the Four P's) with standard school administration skills and knowledge. In many cases it may be necessary to select a leadership team, rather than a single leader, to get the combination of outlooks and skills needed, e.g. a principal or superintendent committed and equipped to lead the shift to the new paradigm and an assistant principal or superintendent capable of "flying the aeroplane" while it is being rebuilt.

3. Pre-service training. Given the great difficulty of changing the mind-sets of those who have been professionally socialized into the present educational policy paradigm, great emphasis should be placed upon educating a new generation of leaders whose minds will be open to new paradigm thinking--who indeed, will help to fashion the new paradigm, since it is likely that no more than an outline or some components of the new paradigm needed are visible at this time.

Since many of our present school administration training programs emphasize passing on the expertise of current practicing administrators to future leaders, this may require significant revision in curriculum and personnel. Since even "new paradigm" leaders must have expertise in running schools--and in operating within the present system even as it is in transition, some portion of the preparation of new administrators must still include this kind of traditional training. But it may be that more of this technocratic training should be turned over to the school systems themselves, where the expertise primarily resides anyway, while the resources of the

universities should be devoted more to helping new candidates develop the "Four P's" of new paradigm leadership.

4. In-service training. The reorientation and education of existing school leaders regarding new paradigm thinking is a high priority for at least three reasons:

First, there is great urgency in beginning the serious restructuring of public education in the United States along the lines of the new paradigm discussed in this paper. Already, frustration over the lack of progress in reforming public schools is leading to dangerous erosion of the public's loyalty to the whole institution of public education.[9] While many reform commissions and individual reformers are calling increasingly for fundamental restructuring, progress in this direction will continue to be slight--and may well backfire in many cases--unless more school principals and superintendents understand and become committed to the new approach. They more than anyone else will control what actually happens in schools, and if they continue to operate in accordance with the old paradigm, the behavior of students, teachers, parents and community is likely also to continue to conform to this obsolete policy framework.

A second reason why it's important to try to help existing school administrators shift to the new paradigm is that the education of a new generation of educational leaders is likely to be crippled so long as their natural role models now in leadership positions continue to exemplify the old paradigm. Not all old dogs can be taught new tricks, but unless a greater number begin to shift than the few who thus far have become leaders in the new thinking it will be hard to get the new leadership to develop a new outlook.

A third reason for including in-service education on the "crisis management" agenda is that many new principals and other leaders will be appointed in the next few years who will not have had preservice education to prepare them for new paradigm leadership. There is urgent need to set up programs to help them develop the new orientation before they become socialized into the values and mind-sets of the existing paradigm.

5. Paradigm competence. The education of the leadership now needed whether it be pre-service or in-service, must address directly the first of the Four P's: paradigm competence. This means that school leaders must learn both the process of paradigm shifts (e.g. how paradigms operate to control

behavior and thinking, how difficult they are to change, etc.) and the content of the new paradigm thinking.

Preparation programs could do worse than having students either read, or at least become familiar with, the book that started the discussion of paradigm shifts in the United States--Kuhn's *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions,* which was almost unknown in education administration circles until a few years ago and is still more often cited than studied.[10] A video tape on paradigm shifts, Joel Barker's *The Business of Paradigms,* has also proved useful in helping school administrators understand how they operate. A variety of materials is available on the content of the new paradigm thinking.[11]

6. Passion, persistence, and political savvy. The other three of the Four P's--passion, persistence, and political savvy---should of course be primary concerns in the recruitment and selection of new leaders. But training programs also can contribute to strengthening these important qualities. In the first place, merely explaining and legitimizing their importance for the educational leadership needed today can help. The use of texts like Thomas Sergiovanni's *Value-Added Leadership: How to Get Extraordinary Performance in Schools* (Harcourt, Brace Jonvanovich, 1990), which stresses the importance of values, passion, "leadership by outrage," etc., can help to counteract the technocratic, value-neutral, and academic biases of many school administration texts.

Finally, the study of new paradigm thinking should be for the purpose of helping new leaders develop their own strong convictions rather than just to give them academic knowledge of other people's thinking. Strong personal conviction is one source of passion, persistence and political engagement, and conviction can come from study as well as experience.

7. History, philosophy, and political theory. While the direct study of new paradigm thinking can help new leaders develop their own convictions and visions for the future of public education, full understanding and commitment, and the ability to translate this commitment into meaningful symbolic leadership, can come only from understanding the history, values, philosophical assumptions, political theory, and ideological problems involved in the shifts now taking place. The present bureaucratic/"winners-and-losers" paradigm of American public education has historical roots. It was created intentionally by policy-makers over many decades, operating on the basis of certain assumptions, values, and concepts.

At the turn of the century, for instance, leaders were proud to advocate the "winners-and-losers" approach; it was viewed as an appropriate way to implement the "Social Darwinism" of the day. Charles Eliot, president of Harvard University and a leader of school reform in that era, saw society as "divided into layers" with "distinct characteristics and distinct educational needs": "the managing, leading, guiding class," the skilled workers, "the commercial class," and at the bottom, the "thick fundamental layer engaged in household work, agriculture, mining, quarrying, and forest work." A prime function of the schools, as he saw it, was "to sort the pupils and sort them by their evident or probable destinies" within these "four layers in civilized society."[12] It is not hard to see in these sentiments the roots of present day tracking practices and low expectations for those in the lower tracks.

Even the great democrat, Thomas Jefferson, at the end of the 18th century, in advocating a public education system for the state of Virginia, proposed that "twenty of the best geniuses be raked from the rubbish" in each county and given six years of education at public expense, with only ten of the twenty to be selected for secondary school.[13]

Most school leadership programs in the United States provide too little space for studying these historical roots and their ideological implications. To prepare the leaders needed for the future, emphasis will have to shift toward these areas of intellectual development. They need to know that not only practices and policies, but even policy frameworks and underlying values and assumptions, are the creation of human society and, therefore, can be changed by human society. Leaders such as Churchill, Martin Luther King, and Gandhi, led from a basis of deep historical and ideological roots. Helping leaders gain these roots is a contribution that universities can make.[14]

8. Race, class, and cultural bias. It is clear that race and class have a great deal to do with what has been happening (and not happening) in American education, both past and present. It is unlikely that the grossest examples of low expectations and ineffective bureaucratic schools--e.g., in America's inner cities---would have been tolerated if their primary victims were not relatively powerless poor and minority children. The more affluent and empowered members of the society who have been dissatisfied with ineffective public schools have been able to enroll their children in more adequate suburban or private schools. So far as race is concerned, it is only since 1954 that the supreme law of the land has outlawed the segregation of African-American children into clearly inferior separate schools. The main purpose of this separation was to reinforce an inferior status for these

children, and the habits and mind-sets that accompany such long-entrenched, enforced inequality do not die out quickly or easily.

The educational leadership for the future will need much more understanding of how race and class issues have inhibited "success-for-all" and collaborative approaches, and how cultural bias has strengthened the stranglehold of the "winners-and-losers"/bureaucratic paradigm on the schools.

9. Celebrate the drama and importance of the change. The changes now beginning to take place in American public education are exceedingly important and dramatic. Many leaders have already called attention to the high stakes involved--predicting that failure of educational reform will lead to the serious decline, if not collapse, of the entire society. Others warn that dangers lurk on every side to derail and pervert the reform movement into dark and dangerous paths. Yet most educational leadership preparation programs have a hum-drum feel to them. Educators have been hearing and talking about educational reform for decades, and it's hard to get people excited that anything important is going on--or needs to go on. Steps must be taken to move the whole enterprise of leadership preparation to a higher plane. Universities and educational officials must symbolize the crucial importance of this component of the educational reform movement, not only by providing the financial support, but also the intellectual and leadership support, needed to upgrade and transform existing programs and start new ones. Without this, the whole enterprise--and the educational reform movement with it--is likely to fail.

NOTES

1. My own fuller explanation of this analysis and call for restructuring is contained in, David S. Seeley, *Education Through Partnership* (Cambridge: Ballinger, 1981, reprinted in paperback, 1985; available through University Press of America, Lanham, MD).

2. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970).

3. Francis Bacon, *Essays* (New York: Macmillan, 1930).

4. John W. Gardner, *On Leadership* (New York: The Free Press, 1990), p. 1.

5. James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (New York: Harper and Row, 1978).

6. Cicero, "De Re Publica," quoted in Gardner, *On Leadership*, p. 113. See also for the leadership qualities needed: Lee G. Bolman and Terrence E. Deal, *Reframing Organizations* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1991), pp. 422-445.

7. Kuhn, p. 156.

8. Gardner, *On Leadership*, p. 127.

9. Thomas Toch, *In the Name of Excellence: The Struggle to Reform the Nation's Schools, Why It's Failing, and What Should Be Done* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

10. Chester Finn in, "The Biggest Reform of All," *Phi Delta Kappan,* April, 1990, relates how his recent study of Kuhn's book was a "rare, clarifying experience" for him, and led him to see for the first time the significance of the paradigm shift confronting American Public education.

11. A further discussion of my own views is found in *Brother, Can You Paradigm* (paper delivered at American Education Research Association, Chicago, IL, April, 1991).

12. Quoted in David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974), p. 129, and Henry J. Perkinson, *The Imperfect Panacea: American Faith in Education, 1865-1965* (New York: Randon House, 1968), p. 145.

13. Henry J. Perkinson, *Two Hundred Years of American Educational Thought* (New York: David McKay Co., 1976), p. 45.

14. On the need for philosophy and history as part of the preparation of educational leaders, see also: Richard A. Gibbony, "Education of Administrators: An American Tragedy," Education Week, April 15, 1987 (Commentary).